



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/486,497 02/28/2000		ALEXANDER VAN DER VEKENS	P00,0062 9888		
75	7590 01/06/2005		EXAMINER		
Morrison & Foerster LLP 1650 Tysons Boulevard			WANG, LIANG CHE A		
Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
McLean, VA 22102			2155	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/486,497	VAN DER VEKENS,	ALEXANDER			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appead Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply h places the applicat	to a ion in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention and the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the main attention at the shortened statutory period for reply the shortened statutory period for reply the shortened statutory period for reply the shortened statutory period for the shortened statutory period for reply the shortened statutory period for the shortened sta	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The final Coriginally set in the final Coriginal Section Sec	n. See MPEP priate extension priate extension Office action; or			
<ul> <li>1.           A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 December 2004</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</li> </ul>						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
_ , ,		see NOTF helow)				
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);</li> </ul>						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or	•	rially reducing or sim	plifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	<b>.</b>			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT	place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:		,				
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 3 and 5-7.	•					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on 14 February 2003 i	s a)⊠ approved or b)⊡ disap	proved by the Exam	iner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•				
10. Other:	,					

4 4 1

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues the examiner assumes the predefined network profile was defined by a user's selection but that is no supported by the text, and no mention is made of how the service was in fact negotiated. This is not found persuasive because Dunn's service and transmission path was negotiated by the user and the service provider (Col 4 lines 43-15), it is clear that when the user is negotiating a service, a user's request must be made to the service provider in order for the negotiation to happen, and this is how the service was negotiated. Applicant also argues there is no need for real-time altering of a user profile, since there is no need of a profile for the user. This is not found persuasive because Dunn is providing a system that has more features than the claimed invention, but however, Dunn teached the is no subsequent negotiation of Qos parameters since all the available selections are already negotiated (Col 4 lines 41-45, Dunn further gives an option for change if there is a need for change (Col4 lines 45-46.)

-Ew

HOSAIN ALAM OPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER